

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the non-final Office Action of August 16, 2004. Reexamination, reconsideration, and allowance of the application and all presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

Upon entry of this First Response, claims 1-19 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 5, and 9-11 are directly amended herein, and claims 13-19 are newly added. It is believed that the foregoing amendments add no new matter to the present application.

Response to §102 Rejections

A proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that a single prior art reference disclose each element of the claim. See, e.g., *W.L. Gore & Assoc., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 U.S.P.Q. 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

Claim 1

Claim 1 presently stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly anticipated by *Hayes* (U.S. Patent No. 6,339,826). Claim 1, as amended, reads as follows:

1. A computer system, comprising:
a display device having a screen for displaying images; and
a security application defining a list of security rules for locking down resources of said computer system, said security application configured to categorize said rules into a plurality of categories and to display at least one of said categories on said screen, said security application configured to determine which of said rules are associated with said one category in response to a selection of said one category by a user of said computer system, said security application configured to display on said screen each of said rules associated with said one category in response to said selection, said security application further configured to allow said user to enable ones of said rules and to cause said computer system to enforce said enabled ones of said rules by modifying a machine state of said computer system, ***wherein different ones of said categories respectively pertain to different ones of a plurality of applications and wherein said rules are categorized such that said***

one category is assigned only to ones of said rules that affect a particular application pertaining to said one category. (Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully assert that *Hayes* is inadequate to anticipate at least the features of claim 1 highlighted above, and the 35 U.S.C. §102 rejection of amended claim 1 is, therefore, improper.

In the Office Action, it is alleged that FIG. 17 of *Hayes* depicts a display of a “category” of “security rules.” However, there is nothing in *Hayes* to indicate that the alleged “security rules” of the alleged “category” only affect a particular application that pertains to the alleged “category.” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that *Hayes* fails to disclose at least the features of claim 1 highlighted above.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that the 35 U.S.C. §102 rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-4 and 13-15

Claims 2-4 presently stand rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly anticipated by *Hayes*. Further, claims 13-15 have been newly added via the amendments set forth herein. Applicants submit that the pending dependent claims 2-4 and 13-15 contain all features of their respective independent claim 1. Since claim 1 should be allowed, as argued hereinabove, pending dependent claims 2-4 and 13-15 should be allowed as a matter of law for at least this reason. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Claim 5

Claim 5 presently stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly anticipated by *Hayes*.

Claim 5, as amended, reads as follows:

5. A system for locking down resources of computer systems, comprising:
means for defining a list of security rules for locking down resources of a computer system;
means for categorizing said rules into a plurality of categories;
means for displaying at least one of said categories;
means for determining, in response to a selection of said one category, which of said rules is associated with said one category;
means for displaying each of said rules determined to be associated with said one category;
means for enabling ones of said rules based on user inputs; and
means for enforcing each of said enabled rules,
wherein different ones of said categories respectively pertain to different ones of a plurality of applications and wherein said categorizing means is configured to assign said one category only to ones of said rules that affect a particular application pertaining to said one category. (Emphasis added).

For at least reasons similar to those set forth above in the arguments for allowance of claim 1,

Applicants respectfully assert that *Hayes* fails to disclose at least the features of claim 5 highlighted above. Accordingly, *Hayes* fails to disclose each feature of claim 5, as amended, and the 35 U.S.C. §102 rejection of claim 5 should, therefore, be withdrawn.

Claims 6-8

Claims 6-8 presently stand rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly anticipated by *Hayes*. Applicants submit that the pending dependent claims 6-8 contain all features of their respective independent claim 5. Since claim 5 should be allowed, as argued hereinabove, pending dependent claims 6-8 should be allowed as a matter of law for at least this reason. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Claim 9

Claim 9 presently stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly anticipated by *Hayes*.

Claim 9, as amended, reads as follows:

9. A method for locking down resources of computer systems, comprising:
defining a list of security rules for locking down resources of a computer system;
categorizing said rules into said plurality of categories, ***wherein different ones of the plurality of categories pertain to different ones of a plurality of applications;***
displaying at least one of said categories;
determining, in response to a selection of said one category, which of said rules is associated with said one category;
displaying each of said rules determined to be associated with said one category;
enabling ones of said rules; and
enforcing each of said enabled rules based on said enabling,
wherein said categorizing comprises assigning said one category only to ones of said rules that affect a particular application pertaining to said one category. (Emphasis added).

For at least reasons similar to those set forth above in the arguments for allowance of claim 1,

Applicants respectfully assert that *Hayes* fails to disclose at least the features of claim 9 highlighted above. Accordingly, *Hayes* fails to disclose each feature of claim 9, as amended, and the 35 U.S.C. §102 rejection of claim 9 should, therefore, be withdrawn.

Claims 10-12 and 16-19

Claims 10-12 presently stand rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly anticipated by *Hayes*. Further, claims 16-19 have been newly added via the amendments set forth herein. Applicants submit that the pending dependent claims 10-12 and 16-19 contain all features of their respective independent claim 9. Since claim 9 should be allowed, as argued

hereinabove, pending dependent claims 10-12 and 16-19 should be allowed as a matter of law for at least this reason. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request that all outstanding objections and rejections be withdrawn and that this application and all presently pending claims be allowed to issue. If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding Applicants' response, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone Applicants' undersigned counsel.

Respectfully submitted,

**THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER
& RISLEY, L.L.P.**

By:



Jon E. Holland

Reg. No. 41,077

(256) 704-3900 Ext. 103

Hewlett-Packard Development Company, L.P.
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400